- 1			
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, INC. Joseph R. Saveri (admitted pro hac vice) Joshua P. Davis (admitted pro hac vice) Matthew S. Weiler (admitted pro hac vice) Kevin E. Rayhill (admitted pro hac vice) 555 Montgomery Street, Suite 1210 San Francisco, California 94111 Phone: (415) 500-6800/Fax: (415) 395-9940 jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com jdavis@saverilawfirm.com mweiler@saverilawfirm.com krayhill@saverilawfirm.com Co-Lead Counsel for the Classes and Attorneys for Individual and Representative Plaintic Cung Le, Nathan Quarry, Jon Fitch, Luis Javier Volume Brandon Vera, and Kyle Kingsbury		
11	[Additional counsel appear on signature page]		
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
13	DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
14 15 16	Cung Le, Nathan Quarry, Jon Fitch, Brandon Vera, Luis Javier Vazquez, and Kyle Kingsbury on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,	Case No.: 2:15-cv-01045 RFB-(PAL) [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO CHALLENGE ATTORNEY-CLIENT	
17	Plaintiffs,	PRIVILEGE	
18	VS.		
19	Zuffa, LLC, d/b/a Ultimate Fighting Championship and UFC,		
20	Defendant.		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	1	Le et al. v. Zuffa, LLC, 2:15-cv-01045-RFB-PAL	
	[[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO CHALLENGE ATTORNEY-CLIENT		

PRIVILEGE

Case 2:15-cv-01045-RFB-BNW Document 320-21 Filed 12/15/16 Page 2 of 2

Court. Having fully considered the papers and arguments of counsel, and good cause having bee shown, the Court hereby ORDERS that the Plaintiffs' motion is GRANTED. IT IS SO ORDERED: United States Magistrate Judge Dated: Dated: 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 10 10 11 12 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 18 19 10 10 11 12 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 18 19 10 10 11 12 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 18 19 10 10 11 11 12 12 13 14 15 16 16 17 18 18 19 19 10 10 11 11 12 12 13 14 15 16 16 17 18 18 19 19 10 10 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	1	The Motion to Challenge Attorney-Client Privilege filed by Plaintiffs Cung Le, Nathan
Court. Having fully considered the papers and arguments of counsel, and good cause having bee shown, the Court hereby ORDERS that the Plaintiffs' motion is GRANTED. IT IS SO ORDERED: United States Magistrate Judge Dated: Dated: 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 10 10 11 12 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 18 19 10 10 11 12 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 18 19 10 10 11 12 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 18 19 10 10 11 11 12 12 13 14 15 16 16 17 18 18 19 19 10 10 11 11 12 12 13 14 15 16 16 17 18 18 19 19 10 10 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	2	Quarry, Jon Fitch, Brandon Vera, Luis Javier Vazquez, and Kyle Kingsbury on behalf of
shown, the Court hereby ORDERS that the Plaintiffs' motion is GRANTED. IT IS SO ORDERED: United States Magistrate Judge Dated: 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	3	themselves and all others similarly situated (collectively, "Plaintiffs") is now pending before the
TI IS SO ORDERED:	4	Court. Having fully considered the papers and arguments of counsel, and good cause having been
United States Magistrate Judge Dated:	5	shown, the Court hereby ORDERS that the Plaintiffs' motion is GRANTED .
United States Magistrate Judge Dated:	6	IT IS SO ORDERED:
Dated:	7	
9 0 0 1 1 2 2 3 3 4 4 5 5 6 6 7 7 8 8 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	8	
11	9	
22 33 44 55 66 677 88 99 60 61 62 62 63 64 62 65 66 62 67 62 88 62 63 64 62 65 66 62 67 62 88 62 63 64 62 65 66 62 67 62 68 62 63 64 62 64 62 64 62 64 62 64 62 64 62 64 62 64 62 64 62 64 62 64 62 64 62 64 62 64 62 64 62 64 62 64 62 64 62 64 62 64 62 64 64 64 64 64 64 64 64 64 64 64 64 64	0	
3	1	
14	2	
1.5 1.6 1.7 1.8 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9	3	
16	4	
17	5	
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	6	
9 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	7	
20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	8	
21	9	
22 23 24 25 26 27 28	20	
23 24 25 26 27 28	21	
24 25 26 27 28	22	
25 26 27 28	23	
26 27 28	24	
27 28		
28		
1 Le et al. v. Zuffa. LLC. 2:15-cv-01045-RFB-P/	28	1 Le et al. v. Zuffa, LLC, 2:15-cv-01045-RFB-PAL